arXiv:1208.4268v1 [math.NT] 21 Aug 2012

A necessary and sufficient Condition for which r^{k^2} is an upper Bound on each van der Waerden Number $W(r, k)$

Robert J. Betts

August 22, 2012

Department of Computer Science and the Division of Continuing Studies,
University of Massachusetts Lowell Campus, One University Avenue,
Lowell, Massachusetts 01854, Robert_Betts271828@alum.umb.edu
www.continuinged.uml.edu

Abstract

Here we answer a conjecture by Ronald Graham about getting finer upper bounds for van der Waerden numbers in the affirmative, but without the application of double induction or combinatorics as applied to sets of integers that contain some van der Waerden number as an element. The mathematical methods we use are easily accessible by those whose field of specialization lies outside of combinatorial number theory, such as discrete mathematics, elementary number theory or analytic number theory.[1][2]

1 Introduction and Apologia

Here we show integer n exists such that, for each $W(r, k)$ we have a necessary and sufficient condition for which

$$W(r, k) < r^{n+1} < r^{k^2} \tag{1}$$

---

[1] **Mathematics Subject Classification** (2010): Primary 11P99; Secondary 68R01.
[2] **Keywords**: Integer colorings, monochromatic, van der Waerden number.

for all k bounded below by a certain positive real number (See Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.2, Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 2.1, Section 2) where $W(r,k)$ is a *van der Waerden number* [4], [11], [6], [7], [9], [10], r is the number of integer colorings in the interval $[1, W(r,k)]$ and k is the arbitrary length of an arithmetic progression contained within this interval. Previously Gowers [3] had found that $W(2,k)$ is bounded above by

$$2^{2^{2^{2^{2^{k+9}}}}}. \tag{2}$$

The author apologizes if the techniques used in this paper are not deep enough for some readers whose field of specialization is in combinatorial number theory. The main motivation for this paper was to prove the existence of the finer upper bound in Eqtn. (1) on $W(r,k)$ than has been found previously, not in the establishment of very deep and very dazzling combinatorial results. Yet if one seeks a proof of Eqtn. (1) that does not require necessarily a deep combinatorial argument one will find it here (See Theorem 2.2, Section 3). It goes without saying that less arcane, more fundamental and elegant proofs certainly are not lacking. Y. A. Khinchin [8], derives a simple proof of the van der Waerden theorem [11], that does not establish an upper bound on van der Waerden numbers. R. Graham and B. L. Rothschild [5] found a fundamental and straightforward proof of the same theorem for $W(2,3)$ that establishes an upper bound of $W(2,3) \leq 325$. Logician S. Shelah [6], [7] designed an ingenius but fundamental and straightforward proof of the Hales–Jewett theorem [7], by defining a discrete N–dimensional hypercube with *Shelah lines*

$$(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{26}), x_i \in [1, 26],$$

where one replaces these integers with alphabet letters such that the edges and diagonals along the hypercube are word strings that receive r–colorings. Shelah also establishes an upper bound on $W(r,k)$ that is a WOWZER function [6], [7].

With regard to the high levels of complexity found within some mathematical fields of specialization in general today and in some more esoteric approaches when one finds a proof to interesting conjectures in particular, Martin Davis [2] remarked that the mathematician "is stymied by the abstruseness of so much of contemporary mathematics." The benefit in our simpler approach we found here to our proof that

$$W(r,k) < r^{k^2},$$

is that our method of proof although simple (See Theorem 2.2, Section 3, and Theorem 3, Section 4) is more accessible even to those whose area of specialization is elementary number theory, to analytic number theorists, to mathematicians or computer scientists with a background in discrete mathematics and to theoretical computer scientists, all who work outside the specialized area covered by the combinatorial number theory literature. This simpler approach here to prove Eqtn. (1) does not require any intricate or arduous combinatorial argument such as double induction, as applied to r–colorings of the integers. Nor do we need Ackermann functions or primitive recursive functions like TOWER() or WOW(). Rather the method here depends solely *on the a priori knowledge* we have already about $W(r, k), r, k, n$ as integers with certain properties, where n is a well-known integer exponent associated with any integer large enough such as any integer greater than r (See Section 2), along with some simple and very basic elementary number theory and analytic number theory.

2 First Result

Every given integer N larger than some given integer r has some integer expansion

$$N = a_n r^n + a_{n-1} r^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0, \tag{3}$$

into powers of r, where the exponent n is such that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{N}{r^n} \right\rfloor = a_n \in [1, \ldots, r-1]. \tag{4}$$

Given any lack of more information about N this at the very least is the *a priori* knowledge we do have about the integer N. We need not know a priori whether N is a newly discovered van der Waerden number with a given r number of integer colorings and with an arithmetic progession of given length k somewhere within integer set $[1, W(r, k)]$, a regular prime, a Wieferich prime, a Mersenne prime or a perfect number. What we can know a priori is what is given in Eqtns. (3)–(4). In fact if we are given a new van der Waerden number N along with $r < N$ but we never are told the new value for k until some time later, we still can find the exponent n, given N and r and we do not need to know the actual value of k to find n. Proceeding from this we then can proceed to find a necessary and sufficient condition for which $N = W(r,k) < r^{k^2}$ will hold (See Theorem 2.2 and proof). If n depends on the integers r, k then we can find these dependent relationships (See Theorem 2.3), given the necessary and sufficient condition. But first we establish one of the tools needed for the task, namely Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $r > 1, k \geq 1$. For each van der Waerden number $W(r,k) > max(\{r,k\})$, for each integer r and for each integer k, there exists some integer $n \geq 1$ such that*

$$W(r,k) < r^{n+1}. \tag{5}$$

Proof. For each such $W(r,k)$ there exists some integer exponent n that is the greatest integer exponent for which r^n will divide $W(r,k)$ (while r^{n+1} does not) and leave some positive integer remainder equal to or less than $r-1$, that is, such that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{W(r,k)}{r^n} \right\rfloor = b_n \in [1, \ldots, r-1]. \tag{6}$$

Let

$$b_n \geq 1, b_n, b_{n-1}, \ldots, b_0 \in [0, \ldots, r-1], \tag{7}$$

so that

$$W(r,k) = b_n r^n + b_{n-1} r^{n-1} + \cdots + b_0, \tag{8}$$

is the expansion of $W(r,k)$ in powers of r. Then since

$$r > r-1 \geq max(\{b_n, b_{n-1}, \ldots, b_0\}), \tag{9}$$

we get

$$W(r,k) = b_n r^n + b_{n-1} r^{n-1} + \cdots + b_0 < r^{n+1}. \tag{10}$$

□

2.1 A Necessary and sufficient Condition for which $W(r,k) < r^{k^2}$

Theorem 2.2. *Let $r > 1, n \geq 1$, where n is as defined in Eqtn. (6). Then*

$$W(r,k) < r^{k^2} \tag{11}$$

is true for each $W(r,k)$ and for each $k > \sqrt{n+1}$, if and only if

$$W(r,k) = b_n r^n + b_{n-1} r^{n-1} + \cdots + b_0 < r^{n+1}, \tag{12}$$

is true for all $n < k^2 - 1$.

Proof. Suppose Eqtn. (12) holds for all $n < k^2 - 1$. Then by Theorem 2.1,

$$W(r,k) = b_n r^n + b_{n-1} r^{n-1} + \cdots + b_0 < r^{n+1} \Longrightarrow \tag{13}$$

$$W(r,k) < r^{n+1} < r^{k^2-1+1} = r^{k^2}, \tag{14}$$

where it is clear in Eqtn. (14) that $W(r,k) < r^{k^2}$ is true for each $W(r,k)$ and for all $k > \sqrt{n+1}$.

Conversely suppose $W(r,k) < r^{k^2}$ holds for each $W(r,k)$ and for each $k > \sqrt{n+1}$. Then again by Theorem 2.1,

$$W(r,k) = b_n r^n + b_{n-1} r^{n-1} + \cdots + b_0 < r^{k^2} \Longrightarrow \tag{15}$$

$$W(r,k) < r^{n+1} < r^{k^2}, \tag{16}$$

since $W(r,k) < r^{n+1}$ follows from Theorem 2.1. Therefore it suffices that $k > \sqrt{n+1} \Longrightarrow n+1 < k^2 \Longrightarrow n < k^2 - 1$ for $W(r,k) < r^{n+1} < r^{k^2}$ to hold in Eqtn. (12) and in Eqtns. (15)–(16). ☐

The following theorem establishes the relationship between the numbers n, r and k.

Theorem 2.3. *Let* $W(r,k) > max(\{r,k\}), r > 1, n \geq 1$ *and suppose Theorem 2.1 holds. Then the following four conditions hold:*

1. $n > \frac{\log k}{\log r} - 1$,

2. $\sqrt[n+1]{k} = O(r)$,

3. *For each triplet* n, r, k *there exists* $a(r,k) \in \mathbb{R}$, *such that*

$$n = a(r,k)\frac{\log k}{\log r} - 1, \tag{17}$$

if and only if

$$a(r,k) = (n+1)\frac{\log r}{\log k} \tag{18}$$

where, if $r < k$ *then* $a(r,k) < n+1$, *if* $r = k$ *then* $a(r,k) = n+1$ *and if* $r > k$ *then* $a(r,k) > n+1$.

4. *For each triplet n, r, k there exists $a(r,k) \in \mathbb{R}$, such that*

$$k = r^{\frac{n+1}{a(r,k)}} \tag{19}$$

if and only if

$$a(r,k) = (n+1)\frac{\log r}{\log k} \tag{20}$$

where, if $r < k$ then $a(r,k) < n+1$, if $r = k$ then $a(r,k) = n+1$ and if $r > k$ then $a(r,k) > n+1$.

Proof. To prove Condition 1, we use Theorem 2.1 and since

$$W(r,k) > max(\{r,k\}), \tag{21}$$

implies $W(r,k) > k$,

$$\begin{aligned} & k < W(r,k) = b_n r^n + b_{n-1} r^{n-1} + \cdots + b_0 < r^{n+1} && (22) \\ \Longrightarrow \quad & \log k < (n+1)\log r && \\ \Longrightarrow \quad & \frac{\log k}{\log r} - 1 < n. && (23) \end{aligned}$$

To prove Condition 2 we use the fact that $k < W(r,k) < r^{n+1} \Longrightarrow k < r^{n+1}$,

$$k < r^{n+1} \Longrightarrow \sqrt[n+1]{k} = O(r). \tag{24}$$

Finally we prove Condition 3 and Condition 4. For Condition 3,

$$\begin{aligned} a(r,k) \quad &= \quad (n+1)\frac{\log r}{\log k} \Longrightarrow a(r,k)\frac{\log k}{\log r} = (n+1) \\ &\Longrightarrow \quad a(r,k)\frac{\log k}{\log r} - 1 = n. \end{aligned}$$

Conversely

$$\begin{aligned} n = a(r,k)\frac{\log k}{\log r} - 1 \quad &\Longrightarrow \quad (n+1)\log r = a(r,k)\log k \\ &\Longrightarrow \quad (n+1)\frac{\log r}{\log k} = a(r,k). \end{aligned}$$

For Condition 4,

$$\begin{aligned} a(r,k) = (n+1)\frac{\log r}{\log k} \quad &\Longrightarrow \quad \log k = \frac{n+1}{a(r,k)} \log r \\ &\Longrightarrow \quad k = r^{\frac{n+1}{a(r,k)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Conversely

$$\begin{aligned} k = r^{\frac{n+1}{a(r,k)}} \quad &\Longrightarrow \quad \log k = \frac{n+1}{a(r,k)} \log r \\ &\Longrightarrow \quad a(r,k) = (n+1)\frac{\log r}{\log k}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Remark Just because the number $a(r,k)$ that appears in Condition 3 and in Condition 4 depends upon the values of r and k, such dependence upon these arguments of $W(r,k)$ does not mean that this real number $a(r,k)$ does not exist for each and every allowable choice of r and k and for each and every van der Waerden number (See Table 1). The commutative field $\mathbb{R}$ has every nonzero element in it being a unit and it is closed under addition and $\mathbb{R} - \{0\}$ is closed under multiplication and so the field of real numbers contains all the required field elements $n+1, k, r, \log k, \log r, a(r,k)$ with the required field operations $+, \times$ holding between them for both Condition 3 and Condition 4 to hold. In fact we do have a priori knowledge that each real number $a(r,k)$ must exist in $\mathbb{R}$ for each value of n, for each value of $W(r,k)$, for each value of r and for each value of k (Table 1).

2.2 What happens if $r = k$

Corollary 2.1. *Suppose Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3 hold. Let*

$$\log r > \frac{a(r,k)\log(n+1)}{2(n+1)}. \tag{25}$$

Then $k > \sqrt{n+1}$. *Moreover if* $r = k$ *then* $r = k > \sqrt{n+1}$.

Proof. From Condition 3 and Condition 4 in Theorem 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned} & \log r > \frac{a(r,k)\log(n+1)}{2(n+1)} && (26) \\ \Longrightarrow\ & \log k = \frac{(n+1)\log r}{a(r,k)} > \frac{1}{2}\log(n+1) \\ \Longrightarrow\ & k = r^{\frac{n+1}{a(r,k)}} > \sqrt{n+1}. && (27) \end{aligned}$$

Finally suppose $r = k$. Then from Condition 3 and Condition 4 in Theorem 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \log r = \log k &> \frac{a(k,k)\log(n+1)}{2(n+1)} = \frac{(n+1)\log(n+1)}{2(n+1)} && (28) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\log(n+1) \\ \Longrightarrow\ & r = k > \sqrt{n+1}. && (29) \end{aligned}$$

□

2.3 The Condition $k > \sqrt{n+1}$ holds as n grows larger

Theorem 2.4. *Let Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3 hold,* $r \geq 2$ *and*

$$W(r,k) = b_n r^n + b_{n-1}r^{n-1} + \cdots + b_0, \qquad (30)$$

as n *and* $W(r,k)$ *both increase without limit. Then* $k > \sqrt{n+1}$.

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. Assume $k \leq \sqrt{n+1}$ holds as $n \to \infty$ in Eqtn. (30). Then using Condition 2 in Theorem 2.3 and for some positive real ε such that $\varepsilon \ll 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} k < W(r,k) < r^{n+1} \Longrightarrow \sqrt[n+1]{k} &< r && (31) \\ &\Longrightarrow \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[n+1]{k} \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[n+1]{\sqrt{n+1}} \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} (n+1)^{1/2(n+1)} = 1 \\ &\Longrightarrow \sqrt[n+1]{k} = O(r = 1+\varepsilon), && (32) \end{aligned}$$

as n grows large, a contradiction, since $r \geq 2$ was given. Therefore we must have $k > \sqrt{n+1}$ as n grows larger. □

3 Computational Results

We apply the results from the previous Sections for known van der Waerden numbers in Table 1. Logarithms are taken to the base $e = 2.718\cdots$

r	k	n	$\log r$	$\log k$	$a(r,k)$	$W(r,k)$	r^{n+1}	r^{k^2}
2	3	3	0.6931	1.0986	2.5235	9	2^4	2^9
2	4	5	0.6931	1.3862	3	35	2^6	2^{16}
2	5	7	0.6931	1.6094	3.4452	178	2^8	2^{25}
2	6	10	0.6931	1.7917	4.2552	1132	2^{11}	2^{36}
3	3	3	1.0986	1.0986	4	27	3^4	3^9
4	3	6	1.3862	1.0986	8.8325	76	4^7	4^9

Table 1.

4 Boundedness for $W(2,k)$ when $k-1=p$ is Prime

In this Section we use the definition [7],

$$EXPONENT(k^2) = 2^{k^2}.$$

Theorem 4.1. *Let Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.1 hold, such that*

$$W(r,k) < r^{n+1} < r^{k^2}. \tag{33}$$

Then $W(2,k) < EXPONENT(k^2)$.

Proof. This follows automatically by setting $r = 2$, since

$$W(2,k) < 2^{n+1} < EXPONENT(k^2). \tag{34}$$

□

4.1 *When* $k-1=p$ *is prime*

The upper bounds we found in the previous Sections help us to find an integer interval on the real line in which one can find van der Waerden numbers when $r=2, k-1=p$, where p is a prime.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $k = p + 1$, where p is any prime such that*

$$(\sqrt{n+1}) - 1 < p. \tag{35}$$

Furthermore let Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.1 hold. Then

$$p2^p < W(2, p+1) < 2^{(p+1)^2}. \tag{36}$$

Proof. The lower bound in Eqtn. (36) was established already by Berlekamp [1]. If p is bounded below as given in Eqtn. (35) then

$$\begin{aligned} p2^p &< W(2, p+1) = b_n 2^n + b_{n-1} 2^{n-1} + \cdots + b_0 && (37) \\ &< 2^{n+1} < 2^{(p+1)^2} \\ &\Longrightarrow p2^p < W(2, p+1) < 2^{(p+1)^2}. && (38) \end{aligned}$$

□

References

[1] Berlekamp, E., A construction for partitions which avoid long arithmetic progressions, *Canadian Mathematical Bulletin*, **11** (1968) pp. 409–414.

[2] Davis, M., *Computability and Unsolvability*, Dover Publications, NY, 1982.

[3] Gowers, T., A new proof of Szemerédi‘s theorem, *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, **11** (3), (2001) pp. 465–588.

[4] Graham, R. L., Some of my favorite Problems in Ramsey Theory, *INTEGERS: Electronic Journal of Combinatorial Number Theory*, **7** (2007) #A15.

[5] Graham, R. L., Rothschild, B. L., A short proof of van der Waerden‘s theorem on arithmetic progressions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **42** (2), (1974) pp. 385–386.

[6] Graham, R. L., Rothschild, B., Spencer, J., *Ramsey Theory*, Second Edition, John Wiley Interscience, NY, 1990.

[7] Graham, R. L., Spencer, J., Ramsey Theory, *Scientific American*, July (1990), pp. 112–117.

[8] Khinchin, Y. A., *Three Pearls of Number Theory*, Dover Publications, NY.

[9] Landman, B., Robertson, A., *Ramsey Theory on the Integers*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI 2004.

[10] Landman, B., Robertson, A., Culver, C., Some new Exact van der Waerden numbers (2005) arxiv:math/0507019 v1.

[11] van der Waerden, Beweis einer Baudetschen Vermutung, *Nieuw. Arch. Wisk.*, **15** (1927) pp. 212–216.